



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
08/614, 134	03/12/96	SANTILLI	R

BARBARA M BURNS
1756 PLYMOUTH ROAD
SUITE 276
ANN ARBOR MI 48105

F3M1/0705

BROWN, T
EXAMINER

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3304

07/05/96

DATE MAILED:

This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application.
COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

This application has been examined Responsive to communication filed on _____ This action is made final.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), _____ days from the date of this letter.
Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133

Part I THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION:

1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892.
2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948.
3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449.
4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152.
5. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474.
6. _____

Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION

1. Claims 1-8, 10-13 are pending in the application.
Of the above, claims _____ are withdrawn from consideration.
2. Claims _____ have been cancelled.
3. Claims _____ are allowed.
4. Claims 1-8, 10-13 are rejected.
5. Claims _____ are objected to.
6. Claims _____ are subject to restriction or election requirement.
7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes.
8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action.
9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on _____. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are acceptable; not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948).
10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on _____, has (have) been approved by the examiner; disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).
11. The proposed drawing correction, filed _____, has been approved; disapproved (see explanation).
12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has been received not been received been filed in parent application, serial no. _____; filed on _____.
13. Since this application appears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
14. Other

EXAMINER'S ACTION

It is noted that the numbering of the claims has omitted the number "9", therefore, correction is required.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 3, 5, 8, 12-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Thompson or McLeod.

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 6, 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Thompson.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. § 103 which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Subject matter developed by another person, which qualifies as prior art only under subsection (f) or (g) of section 102 of this title, shall not preclude patentability under this section where the subject matter and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same

person.

Claims 4, 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Carson.

Claim 4: To make the golf tee of Thompson to have a pyramid shape would have been consider a mere design choice, since golf tees in the art are constructed having a multitude of shapes.

Claim 10: To make the golf the of Thompson of biodegradable material would have been considered obvious in view of the teachings of Carson since such would enhance grass growth as well as reduce course litter due to lost tees.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Thompson in view of Lettrich.

To construct the tee of Thompson of plastic material would have been considered obvious in view of the teachings of Lettrich, since plastic has been found to be more resistant to breakage than tees made of wood.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Whalan, Wilkinson, Middendorf, Laura.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to T. Brown at telephone number (703) 308-3133.

T. Brown:bhw
July 2, 1996



THEATRICE BROWN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
ART UNIT 334